

JAMES R. BENSON & CLARK H. GREEN,
Editors & Proprietors.

TERMS.

Published every Saturday, at \$3 in advance, or \$34 at the end of the year. No paper discontinued but at the option of the editors until all arrears are paid—and a failure to give notice (before the end of the year) of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines or less, for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

For one square twelve months, twenty dollars.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (at the discretion of the proprietors) until forbid, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

AUTHORIZED AGENTS.

A. R. OLDHAM, Middle Grove, Monroe co.
JAMES HUGHES, Richmond, Ray co.
JAMES HEAD, Four Mile Prairie, Randolph co.
W. F. SWITZLER, Columbia, Boone co.
C. P. BROWN, Platte City, Platte co.
THOMAS JACKMAN, Rochester, Boone co.
W. D. MALONE, Hannibal, Randolph co.
Geo. H. HUBBELL, Trenton, Grundy co.

From Graham's Magazine.

THE FORSAKEN.

BY MARY L. LAWSON.

It was a beautiful sentiment of one whom he had proposed to put away—"Give me, then, back," said she, "that which I brought to you." And the man answered, in his vulgar coarseness of soul—"Your fortune shall return to you." "I thought not of fortune," said the lady; "give me back my real wealth—give me back my beauty and my youth—give me back the virginity of soul—give me back the cheerful mind, and the heart that has never been disappointed."—*Bulwer.*

Think not for fortune's gifts I care,
Alas! what are they now to me,
But give me back youth's promise fair,
And every charm I brought to thee;
Give me again the many years
O'er which thy hand a blight has cast,
Give me the hopes unstained by fears,
Those glowing visions of the past.

Give me that freshness of the soul
That knew no doubt, that feared no ill,
That ne'er had bowed beneath grief's control,
But fondly loved and trusted still,
And that deep fount of holy love
My heart has ever poured on thine.
Hast thou a power earth's power above
Couldst thou restore what once was mine?

Couldst thou give back the cheerful mind,
As cloudless as the beams of day,
That ne'er mid cold neglect had pined,
Or viewed its fairest dreams decay?
Then tell me not of golden store!
Thy proffered gift how poor—how vain—
My real, my only wealth restore—
Give me my happy heart again.

Yet though thou send'st me forth, alone
To brave the cold world's heartless scorn,
Through every trace of love has flown
From her who is indeed forlorn,
I still will proudly bear the worst
That fate may hold in store for me;
It cannot bring a lot more cursed
Than longer to abide with thee.

ORFUL.

The lightning roared, the thunder flashed;
And granny's teapot went to smash—
The rain it whistled, the wind it poured,
And daddy laid down in the corner, about nine o'clock, and snored!

YOU OUGHT TO BE ASHAMED, MR. TOMKINS!

Westminster Police.—Ever since the instructive affair of Lord Frankford and Alice Lowe, every "tinker and tailor and candlestick-maker," in the event of a quarrel with his woman, seems to feel bound to demand the return of every trifle "gusted" at the outset of passion, and whether his name be Montmorency or Muggins the feeling is still the same. In this case, Mr. Tomkins, a pug-nosed, cocoa-nut-headed youth of a bout thirty years' growth, used a very pretty-looking little brunette, of about the same age, for the sum of fifteen shillings! Miss Wilson, the defendant, evidently anticipated a triumph.

"So sweetly she smiled and so softly she spoke," Mr. Tomkins had on his best boots, and he trotted up to the desk like a regular little man of business.

Commissioner—Now, Mr. Tomkins, where's your bill?

"Here, sir," replied Tomkins. It was read as follows:—

"Miss Mary Anne Wilson, Spinster,
To John Jonathan Tomkins, Esq.,
To 2 Torter shel komes - - 6 d
To a pot o' permation - - 0 6
To a set up air brush - - - 8 0

15 0

P. S.—If so you don't pay it I shall summons, so jest look out.—J. J. T.

"You're quite a scholar, I find, Mr. Tomkins," said the Commissioner. "Now, sir, how do you support this claim?"

"Ah! that's it," chimed in Miss Wilson. "You ought to be ashamed of yourself, Mr. Tomkins." (Roars of laughter.)

Mr. Tomkins stated, that for a considerable time it had been his intention to take Miss Wilson for "better or worse," and he had actually put up the bans at St. Bride's Church, when he chanced to "diskiver" something that was a regular bar to his future happiness—something, indeed, so serious, that "nobody couldn't think of putting up with"—(laughter)—and so he (Mr. Tomkins) had apprised the lady in a note, of which the following was a copy:—

"Miss Mary Anne, it's all over—I found it out—and you never want be no wife o' miern—after the way you sarked me—you might as well tell me at first—I thought I was appy—and now I find it out—I send you back the front—and expects u to send me

BOON'S LICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT."—JEFFERSON.

Vol. 3.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1843.

No. 1.

back my things—'bove all the torter shel komes and the air brush—Oh deer—I'm sorry to say—I found it out—So no more—
"Ures—John Jonathan Tomkins."

Amid considerable laughter at this most doleful epistle, the worthy Commissioner asked of Mr. Tomkins what dreadful thing it was he "had found out" that so disturbed him?

"Oh! don't mention it," said Mr. Tomkins; "I found out—that she—that—Miss Wilson had got a little boy." (Roars of laughter.)

Miss Wilson—Oh! Mr. Tomkins, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.—(Laughter.)

"Me nahamed!" said Mr. Tomkins; me!—why I didn't do it."—Immense laughter.)

Commissioner (laughing)—Well, my little man, and so because there was a little boy in the way you broke off the match, eh?

Mr. Tomkins (gathering confidence)—Exactly so, sir; and I don't want nothing more to do with her nor the little boy nather. I want back my presents. (Laughter.)

Commissioner—What do you say to all this, Miss Wilson?

"Say, sir, indeed," replied Miss Wilson, somewhat tartly; "the torter shel komes, as he calls them, was nothing but bone, and I rubbed all the pomatum in my little boy's head, and made a present of the hair brushes to his mother!"

"His mother?" fairly roared Mr. Tomkins; "what then ain't you his mother?" (Laughter.)

Miss Wilson—No, you booby; but I'm his aunt, and you ought to be ashamed of yourself, Mr. Tomkins, you ought—laughter)—you jealous, addle-pated claybrains.

A new light broke in upon Mr. Tomkins; he tried to look imploringly at Miss Wilson, but the Rubicon was passed, and, as the commissioners dismissed the case, Miss Wilson curtseyed gracefully to the court, and again observed that Mr. Tomkins was "a good-for-nothing fellow, and ought to be ashamed of himself," an opinion in which all present fully coincided.—Mr. Tomkins trotted out of court.

REMARKS

DR. MOSS, OF CLAY.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Feb. 7, 1843, upon the bill proposing to elect Members to Congress by general ticket.

Dr. MOSS said—
The speaker, intending to participate in the debate upon this bill, at some period of its continuance, the present presents as favorable an opportunity as will probably be afforded me. I regard this as one of the most important subjects upon which the House has been called to act at this session of the General Assembly. It is important, because we are about to determine by our action in what manner the people of Missouri shall in future elect their Representatives to Congress, the highest legislative body known in our system. The vote of the two houses upon the subject matter of this bill, will determine whether this state shall be divided into five separate congressional districts, each qualified elector voting for but one candidate, or whether the system of electing by general ticket shall be continued, the elector voting for the whole number that the State is entitled to in the lower branch of Congress.

I doubt the power of the house to pass the bill now under consideration, upon the ground that it conflicts with the provisions of a late act of Congress, requiring the people of all the States to elect their members of the House of Representatives by single districts. I hold the act to which I have just referred to be in strict conformity with the constitution of the United States. Entertaining that opinion, it cannot be expected that I will yield this bill my support; on the contrary, I feel bound to give it all that opposition which my duties as a Representative impose upon me. Although the objection just suggested to the bill is of sufficient weight to influence my vote upon this occasion, there are other weighty arguments which present themselves to my mind why this bill should not pass. Although I will not affirm that the system of electing by general ticket is unconstitutional, yet it can, in my opinion, be demonstrated very clearly that single districts were contemplated and expected by the framers of the constitution, when that instrument passed from their hands for action before the conventions of the people.

I hold further, that the principle of popular representation and theory of representative government, as designed by the architects of our system, can only be carried out by electing members to Congress by single districts. It can be made equally plain, that local and individual interests cannot be properly represented in the national legislature by any other than the district plan.

It is equally apparent and can be easily demonstrated, that merit seldom reaches the hall of the popular branch of Congress in any other way.

Upon the subject of my first proposition I will admit that the question was no where distinctly made as between these antagonist systems, either in the general convention that proposed, nor in the conventions of the people that adopted the Federal Constitution; but enough has been said to convince the most incredulous that the district system was in the thoughts and upon the tongue of every man who wrote or debated upon the subject of Representation during that period so interesting in our history when the constitution of the United States was pending before the American people for their adoption or rejection.

I hold in my hands some authority in point, touching the views of the framers of the constitution upon this subject. The book from which I intend to quote is the *Federalist*, a work written over fifty years ago, by three of the most distinguished individuals that this country has given birth to, and three of the brightest lights and luminaries of the eighteenth century. I allude to James Madison, John Jay, and Alexander Hamilton. The work has been justly regarded as a valuable commentary upon the constitution. It is useful for its sound constitutional doctrine,

and is regarded as the highest authority by all, irrespective of party. In the fifty-sixth number of the work just referred to, you will find the following quotation: it is from the pen of James Madison, and was addressed to the American people for the purpose of inducing them to forego their objections to the constitution. It seems that upon this very subject of Representation, an objection was raised by our countrymen. It was contended that under our system, the districts would be so large that the member would not have sufficient local information to be an efficient Representative in combating this objection. Mr. Madison says:

"Divide the largest State into ten or twelve districts, and it will be found that there will be no peculiar local interests in either, which will not be within the knowledge of the Representative of the district."

In this extract, Mr. Madison clearly holds the opinion that the system of single districts is to be adopted under the constitution. But this is not all. From the same work, but a different number, I make the following quotation. Mr. Madison says:

"The district in New Hampshire, in which the State Senators are chosen immediately by the people, are nearly as large as will be necessary for Representatives in Congress; those of Massachusetts are larger than will be necessary for that purpose, and those in New York still more so. In the last State, the members of Assembly for the cities and counties of New York and Albany are elected by nearly as many voters as will be entitled to a Representative in Congress. Pennsylvania is an additional example. Some of her counties, which elect her State Representatives, are almost as large as her districts will be by which her Federal Representatives will be elected. The city of Philadelphia is supposed to contain between fifty and sixty thousand souls, and will therefore form nearly two districts for the choice of Federal Representatives."

The tendency of the above extracts clearly go to show that Mr. Madison considered the single districts as the proper system under the constitution.

Such were the views entertained by James Madison upon the subject of representation in Congress. Such are the views of one who is justly esteemed as the ablest expounder of the Constitution in his day or since. The inquiry very naturally arises here,—Who so well knew the views and opinions of the framers of the Constitution upon the powers of that instrument, or the duties arising under it, as Mr. Madison? He was part and parcel of that constitution well; he shook them daily by the hand; met them face to face; was upon terms of intimacy with all of them; and was, in fact, the master spirit of the day and time in which he lived.

The debates in the State conventions upon the adoption of the constitution show clearly that the same opinion prevailed there, that the single district was the natural system under the constitution. I will only refer to the debates in the convention of North Carolina, held in 1788. Mr. Gallaway, an ardent opponent of the constitution, said, by way of objection to it, that all the members of Congress would be elected from the seaboard. Mr. Steele replied, that the objection was unfounded, as the State would undoubtedly be laid off into districts—to which no reply was made, the convention no doubt coinciding in opinion with Mr. Steele.

But, sir, I have something still stronger than this, going to show the views of the framers of the constitution upon this subject. Something stronger than even the writings of Mr. Madison—still stronger than the debates in the State conventions, and stronger than the contemporaneous writings and speeches of that day. Yes, sir, we have something still stronger than all these. We have action. Yes, sir, we have action upon this subject—the best arbiter, the best regulator, the best index, the best finger board, pointing the right direction, indicating as certainly as the needle inclines to the pole, the true path, the right road to the constitution.

In Virginia, sometimes called the Old Dominion, where lived the Father of his country, where lived Patrick Henry, the Wythes, the Pendletons, the Lees. In New York, the home of Hamilton, Jay, and Livingston. In Massachusetts, where dwelt John and Samuel Adams, Benjamin Hancock, and Fisher Ames. In South Carolina, the abode of Marion and Sumpter. In North Carolina, that gallant old State, the first of the sisterhood that struck for independence, the first that adopted resolutions by her General Assembly, declaring in favor of the glorious cause, the first of the colonies that gave an impetus to that ball that is rolling round the world—the ball of Liberty. In all these States the district system was adopted from the very origin of the government. In eleven of thirteen of the original States, the district system was established with the very adoption of the constitution, going to show most clearly that at least eleven out of the thirteen original States must have concluded that the single district was the most natural system under the constitution.

I hold, sir, that all our past history goes to show clearly and most conclusively that single districts were contemplated by the framers of the Constitution, when that instrument passed from their hands, as is clearly evinced by the writings of James Madison, the debates in the State conventions, by action of most of the original States, and by all the contemporaneous writings and speeches of that day.

Then, sir, if we are satisfied as to the intention of the framers of the constitution upon this interesting question. We are bound to carry out that intention, to reduce that intention to practice by our action here, or else be faithless to the trust reposed in our hands, and show to the world that we are unworthy a seat within these walls.

The next position I assume, to wit, that popular representation, as designed by the architects of our system, cannot be carried out by any other than the district plan.—Touching this subject, Mr. Madison says, the peculiarities which distinguish the two Houses of Congress are, that one is a representation of States, the other of citizens. In the Senate, the people are represented as political corporations, or aggregated communities; in the lower House, as individual members of society, in that proportion in which they are bound to contribute means to carry on the government, and men to fight its battles. It is said that the provision in the constitution against originating revenue bills in the Senate, was to secure the citizens against the oppression of the representatives of the State in which he himself resides, and to give the introduction of the laws on this important subject to the immediate Representatives of the people, with whom they have a com-

mon local interest, inhale the air of the same vicinity, and meet face to face in the elections of the country. It seems to be at variance with the spirit of this arrangement, that the Representative should be elected by the entire vote of the State, instead of subdivisions of the people. No member here has ever entertained the wild project of electing the members of this hall by general ticket. Yet popular representation was never intended to be more complete in this body than in the House of Representatives in Congress. Upon the subject coming properly within its sphere of action, no proposition is more susceptible of demonstration than this. Then, sir, carry out the parallel, and suppose a gentleman use here in his place, and propose that in future the members of this house shall be elected by general ticket, the whole State constituting but one district, all would at once pronounce that the member was better suited to be the inmate of an asylum for the unfortunate, than the member of an enlightened legislative assembly.

I hold that popular representation is more complete in the British House of Commons, than in an American Congress elected by general ticket; for, sir, under the British system, towns, counties, parishes, and boroughs have each a representative in Parliament, whilst here it takes a whole State to elect a member to Congress. A State, too, containing a larger number of square miles than the British isle, with six hundred members in Parliament.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we are guilty of the folly of establishing a system of representation less complete, less free, less liberal, less popular in its character than the system of our ancestors, from which we separated after one of the fiercest struggles in modern times. The very idea of popular representation implies that the representative is to be elected not by entire States, as well in ancient as modern times, the members composing those bodies have been elected by single districts, departments, or small divisions of the people. The district system insures that personal acquaintance which is so necessary between constituent and representative, and is the very gist of true representation. It makes political advancement depend as much upon good conduct and virtuous action, as upon powers of mind or great acquirements. Under the opposite system, the responsibility of the voter being more extended or divided, indifference and apathy are the result, and tickets are made up without a due regard to private character, and without consulting the great constituent body, the people. Suppose, sir, a State is entitled to five members in Congress, and the election is conducted under the general ticket system: it will frequently happen that two good men are put upon a ticket with three mean men; thus the good men pack the bad men into Congress on their backs, the people having of necessity to vote for the bad in order to avail themselves of the services of the two good men who may happen to be on the ticket. It may be laid down as a proposition, which cannot be controverted, that where this system prevails, it transfers of necessity into the hands of a few who give direction to the entire vote of the State. It is nearly allied to the caucus system in its most odious and revolting form, and enables a few political jugglers and party hacks, to dictate to a whole State, who shall be taken and who cast off. A few political aspirants unite together and decide for the whole people who shall be presented to them as candidates for Congress, and thus the honest yeomanry of the country are compelled to vote for men with whom they are personally unacquainted, never having seen them, and probably never having heard of them before. In fact they are called on to vote by faith, and are more willing and passive machines in the hands of political leaders. This is a part of the glories of the general ticket system: from all such I hope to be forever delivered. It compels us to go it blind, unacquainted with the person, talents, or merit of those we seek our suffrage. Sir, the people of our country will repudiate this system sooner or later. The framers of this country want to know the men who seek to represent them. They desire to judge for themselves, and not through others, as to the fitness of certain men for public stations. The district system offers this opportunity to every individual who may wish it. It is the only plan by which the candidate for political favor must stand or fall upon his own merits. The general ticket system may be, and has been used to the advantage of one class of citizens over another. The history of our own State proves the assertion to be true. In Missouri the seats in Congress have always been a monopoly in favor of two of the learned professions—law and medicine. Although Missouri has been in the Union over twenty years, no individual, with one solitary exception, out of these professions has reached the halls of Congress. Although ours is an agricultural State, and we are an agricultural people, having but little commerce, and scarce any manufactures—although this has been our case for nearly a quarter of a century, yet not a single farmer from Missouri has heard his own voice in the capacity of a representative within the walls of the capitol at the seat of the General Government. Yes, sir, the general ticket system in this State has been a monopoly, an exclusive privilege of the most odious character. I do not object to the gentle men of the learned professions getting to Congress, but I am opposed to perpetuating a system which confers upon them an exclusive right to the seats in that body. I would place them on a fair equality with other citizens—upon that platform where the constitution intended to put them, and then let merit determine the question of conflicting claims. Two years hence, if this bill passes, and I do not doubt it, you will have five lawyers on your ticket for Congress. I could name the gentlemen, but dislike to do so. I am requested by several around me to mention names, but must decline, as I do not wish to betray confidence; suffice it to say that the ticket will remain pretty much as at present, with this exception, that the doctors lately elected will be knocked into a cocked hat; forced to give way, in order to promote the political fortunes of other gentlemen.

So near to the hearts of the people is the district system, that attempts have been made by many of the States to engraft it upon the constitution itself. The attention of Congress has been called to this subject by various resolves, passed at different times, by the legislatures of North Carolina, Massachusetts, and Virginia. Although the States just named had no doubt of

the intention of the framers of the constitution, and of the powers Congress to require all the States to be distrusted, yet so much were they impressed with the importance of this subject, that they desired the district system to be incorporated upon the constitution, thereby placing it beyond the fluctuation of temporary legislation.

I have referred to the action of the States; to show the high estimation in which this system is held by our countrymen every where. So popular is the system, that it has been in operation for more than fifty years in most of the old States; and in three-fourths of the new it has been adopted upon their coming into the Union.

The single district system will disseminate power among the people of the States; spreading its broad cast over the country, bringing the right of representation home to every man's door, causing every voice to be heard, and every vote to tell in the people's House of Representatives.

The general ticket system, if generally adopted, would enable four of the largest States—New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Ohio, to control the entire legislation of Congress. Let those States come into that body with over one hundred representatives united in their politics, anxious to promote the power of their respective States, and you will have a concentration of power in Congress which will overshadow the small States and place the control of the National Legislature in the hands of four States; thus destroying at one fell swoop every thing like equality of representation. Sir, I believe with the celebrated George McDuffie, that this system, generally adopted, will ultimately lead to the prostration of the right of suffrage, and the overthrow of liberty itself.

In the district system alone will the rights of minorities in the States be heard. It needs no labored effort to prove the importance of minorities to the preservation of public liberty; they keep a watchful eye over majorities, and are the first to sound the bugle notes of alarm. They are vigilant to see that majorities keep within the pale of the constitution, and are just in the exercise of political powers.

Under the late apportionment law of Congress, the people are entitled to two hundred and twenty-three representatives in that body. Let the States be divided into that many single districts, and we should have the most perfect system of representation on earth. Each member thus elected will go into Congress direct from those with whom he has been closely associated; unbiased by State influence, and entirely aloof from State dictation; he will then be, as he should, the independent Representative of the people of his own district. Local rights and interests will then be fairly represented. Every wish will then be known; every right seen, and every wrong redressed. Then the House of Representatives will be one what the constitution intended it should be—a bright and faithful mirror, reflecting the shades of the multifarious interests of this country as they lie extended, broadcast over this beautiful and favored land. Let this State pursue the example of Georgia, who, although the first to raise the flag of opposition to the late mandamus act of Congress, as it is called, has nevertheless gone on to district in pursuance of that act. Expecting that some future Congress will repeal the obnoxious law, we should be very careful how we raise the banner of opposition to a law which comes down to us with so many sanctions. It has passed through a tribunal worthy of our respect; it comes to us from an American Congress—a body who, in point of ability and wisdom, are not excelled by any in ancient or modern times. The long famed Roman Senate, once the admiration of the world for over a thousand years, will not compare with the American Senate; nor will the English Parliament, a body remarkable for its learning for many centuries. As sound constitutional lawyers and eminent jurists, there are some in the American Congress who are not behind Chancellor Kent or Justice Story. The law of Congress, then, requiring the States to be distrusted, comes to us in a very imposing form, from a body of men who have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and who are so eminently calculated to judge of that instrument—from a President who has taken the same oath. But it has been said, this law is unconstitutional. Who shall judge of that? Shall Congress, who passed it, and the Executive who approved it—the whole law making power thus uniting in its enactment—judge of its constitutionality, or shall it be left to the legislature of the different States to nullify it, if they so desire?

This, Mr. Speaker, will be nullification with a mighty vengeance, compared with which South Carolina nullification sinks into nothingness. Sir, we mistake the remedy. The remedy lies with the constituent body—the people—if they do not like the exercise of this power upon the part of Congress, let them send Representatives there who will repeal the law. It has been said that Congress cannot issue a mandate to the State Legislatures. The constitution issued the mandate over fifty years ago, that the legislation of the States in this particular, should at any time be superseded by that of Congress, either wholly or in part. I trust, Mr. Speaker that the Legislature of Missouri will withdraw their opposition to this law. There is much depending upon the State Legislatures in supporting the General Government. That government cannot come into the States and enforce the execution of its laws by an armed body of men, nor can it effect its object through the tribunals of justice. The crime of omission of constitutional duty on the part of a State, like

the crime of parenticide among the Athenians, is not provided for. Every thing here is left to accountability to public opinion—to our duties to an honest constituency—to the oaths we have taken. It is at last honor and conscience upon which repose this most perfect of all human institutions that has ever been established for the safety and happiness of Man.

From the New York Tribune.

Selection in Philadelphia—Deliberate murder of the seducer by the brother of the seduced—great excitement.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 12, P. M.

In one of my regular letters, a few days since, I briefly alluded to the alleged seduction, or rather abduction, as it was then called—of a young lady residing in Southwark, and stated, at the time, that something serious was likely to grow out of the affair. That prediction has been most sadly realized, and I will now state, as briefly and truly as possible, all the circumstances connected with the dreadful affair, which has thrown our whole community into a state of the greatest excitement.

On Tuesday and Wednesday last, considerable talk was produced by the sudden disappearance of a young and handsome girl, aged about 16, named Sarah Mercer, the daughter of Thomas Mercer, 33 Queen street, one of the most wealthy and respectable inhabitants of Southwark. A young man of this city, named Hutchinson Heberton, was arrested on suspicion of being connected in her abduction, and taken before Alderman Mitchell, at the instance of the girl's brother, who threatened him then with instant death if he refused, but was discharged in consequence of the girl's return to her parents on Wednesday evening. It was ascertained, however, that Heberton had seduced the young girl, and that she had gone to a house of ill fame, in the neighborhood of Pine and Twelfth streets, kept by Louisa O'Neil, where he had been in the habit of meeting her.

Miss Mercer's absence, as well as her return, according to all statements, was voluntary. The anguish of the family at the knowledge of the dishonor that had fallen upon the daughter, no tongue can tell nor pen describe. To wipe out the stain so far as it was possible so to do, a marriage was proposed to the seducer. This was declined on his part, and the brother of the seduced then challenged him. This was also declined. The infuriate brother, stung almost to madness, determined not to be balked in his revenge. He watched the movements of Heberton, and having ascertained that he was to leave the city on Friday afternoon or evening in a carriage by way of Camden, he managed to discover the same in the street, when he employed one of Vaneiver's vehicles, driven by a young man, to whom Mercer gave instructions, pointing out the carriage, to lose sight of it on no condition, but keep close to it, and wherever it went to follow after it. In this carriage, in company with Heberton, was seated his legal friend and adviser, Jas. C. Vandike, Esq., from whose office the deceased had left with the avowed object of preventing a meeting with the misguided and excited Mercer. After having driven through several streets, the carriage entered the ferry boat John Fitch, then lying at Market street wharf. Mercer followed after, leaped from his vehicle unobserved, and concealed himself behind a box on board the boat, armed with one of Colt's six-barreled pistols. Shortly after the carriage was driven on board with the blinds drawn up, and when within a few yards of the Jersey shore Mr. Vandike got out of the same, walked around, it is presumed, to see if it was safe, when Mercer approached the carriage and fired four balls into it in quick succession. One of them proved fatal, taking effect under the left shoulder blade, and penetrated the heart. Heberton was conveyed to Cate's tavern in Camden, where he expired in a few minutes. The murderer was immediately arrested, and upon his person was found the pistol, two barrels of which still retained their charge. His conduct during the remainder of the evening is represented as having been wild and frantic, evidently laboring under the most intense excitement.

Thus has the imprudent conduct of a once fond and doting daughter hurried into misery the peace and happiness of aged and venerable parents! When Miss Sarah Mercer entered her father's residence, after leaving the abode of infamy on Pine street, she avowed her determination not to remain—expressed her attachment for the deceased—and it was only by force that she was compelled to do so. It is also said that her brother had sworn that she, too, who had disgraced her family, should fall the instant he laid eyes on her; but fortunately he was not permitted to stain his hands with a double murder.

The parties in the above lamentable drama are of the most wealthy and respectable character. Of the Mercers, I have partly spoken; and will only add, that the name of the murderer is Singleton Mercer, for the past two or three years a clerk in the store of Carson & Newbold, south wharves, not yet 20 years of age, fond of society and the world. The murdered, Hutchinson Heberton, an estimable man, and who died possessed of great wealth. He is also related to the Messrs. Hebertons, merchants, Matthew Newkirk and numerous other wealthy and respectable citizens. He was about 26 years of age, 5 feet 10 inches, and considered one of the handsomest young men in Philadelphia. He formerly wore a mustache, but had it shaved off on Wednesday last. He resided with his widowed mother, Ann Heberton, Ninth street, near Arch; where his lifeless body was conveyed on Saturday afternoon about 4 o'clock.

Young Mercer, was taken by the Sheriff of Gloucester county to the Woodbury jail, to await his trial for the dreadful deed he has committed, about 1 o'clock yesterday, accompanied by two cousins and an attorney. He appeared perfectly calm and collected.

There are various rumors afloat in connection with this tragic occurrence, and the